



# City of Madison

City of Madison  
Madison, WI 53703  
www.cityofmadison.com

## Meeting Minutes - Approved URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

---

Wednesday, March 17, 2010

4:30 PM

215 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd.  
Room 260 (Madison Municipal Building)

---

### CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL

**Present:** 8 -  
Marsha A. Rummel; Mark M. Smith; Dawn O. Weber; Todd R. Barnett;  
Bruce F. Woods; Richard L. Slayton; John A. Harrington and Jay B. Ferm

**Excused:** 2 -  
Ronald S. Luskin and R. Richard Wagner

### APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion was made by Ferm, seconded by Rummel, to Approve the Minutes for the Special Meeting of February 24, 2010; and Regular Meetings of February 17 and March 3, 2010. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

### PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

### AGENDA OVERVIEW

- Agenda overview.

### SPECIAL ITEMS OF BUSINESS

### ROLL CALL

**Present:** 9 -  
Marsha A. Rummel; Mark M. Smith; Dawn O. Weber; Todd R. Barnett;  
Bruce F. Woods; Richard L. Slayton; John A. Harrington; Ronald S. Luskin  
and Jay B. Ferm

**Excused:** 1 -  
R. Richard Wagner

1. [17735](#) Report of the Facade Improvement Grant Staff Team  
A: 916 Williamson Street (Madison Sourdough Company)  
B: 811 Williamson Street (vacant).

916 Williamson Street: The motion provided that the garage door be modified to address comments with approval by staff and that the awning signage and use of the existing ground sign be approved by Zoning.

**A motion was made by Luskin, seconded by Barnett, to Accept the report of the Facade Improvement Grant Staff Team for 916 Williamson Street. The motion passed by voice vote/other.**

**A motion was made by Luskin, seconded by Barnett, to Accept the report of the Facade Improvement Grant Staff Team for 811 Williamson Street. The motion passed by voice vote/other.**

**PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS**

**ROLL CALL**

**Present:** 8 -  
Marsha A. Rummel; Mark M. Smith; Dawn O. Weber; Todd R. Barnett;  
Bruce F. Woods; Richard L. Slayton; John A. Harrington and Jay B. Ferm

**Excused:** 2 -  
Ronald S. Luskin and R. Richard Wagner

- 2. [12028](#) 100 North Hamilton Street - Comprehensive Design Review of Signage in C4 District. 4th Ald. Dist.

The motion was passed noting address of the following concerns:

- The package receives high marks, but banners could come back with options as noted above, along with options for Sign Type I.
- The bike and car signing is OK with the donor sign, along with the wall sign panels.
- Sign Type A needs to be reexamined doesn't fit, need to provide room to breathe on the Flatiron and elevation of the building.

**A motion was made by Barnett, seconded by Smith, to Refer to the URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION. The motion passed by voice vote/other.**

**ROLL CALL**

**Present:** 9 -  
Marsha A. Rummel; Mark M. Smith; Dawn O. Weber; Todd R. Barnett;  
Bruce F. Woods; Richard L. Slayton; John A. Harrington; R. Richard Wagner and Jay B. Ferm

**Excused:** 1 -  
Ronald S. Luskin

- 3. [17567](#) 5802 Odana Road - Comprehensive Design Review/Street Graphics Variance and Minor Facade Renovations in UDD No. 3. 19th Ald. Dist.

The motion for referral required address of the following:

- The three ground signs should be looked at to be consistent in size and

height with an alternative provided for the pylon sign (Don Miller) to show size and extent if conforming to all requirements of Urban Design District No. 3.

- The use of alucabond on the Subaru building should wrap around to be on both perpendicular sides fully or at a minimum of 10-15 feet.
- Look at spacing and scale of signs on the Chrysler building as well as that of the Subaru and Don Miller wall signage to be consistent with the above stated comments.
- Provide landscaping around base of all ground signs and fill wall signage as it appears with the curvature and warp of the existing front façade of both buildings.

**A motion was made by Barnett, seconded by Rummel, to Refer to the URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION. The motion passed by voice vote/other.**

4. [17628](#) 4622 Dutch Mill Road - Demolition and New Construction of an Office Building in UDD No. 1. 16th Ald. Dist.

**A motion was made by Wagner, seconded by Rummel, to Refer to the URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION. The motion passed by voice vote/other.**

**UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

5. [11468](#) 2222 South Park Street - Modifications to Previously Approved Plans for The Urban League/Public Library Building in Urban Design District No. 7. 14th Ald. Dist.

**A motion was made by Wagner, seconded by Weber, to Grant Final Approval. The motion passed by the following vote:**

- Excused:** 1 -  
Ronald S. Luskin
- Ayes:** 7 -  
Marsha A. Rummel; Mark M. Smith; Dawn O. Weber; Todd R. Barnett; Bruce F. Woods; John A. Harrington and R. Richard Wagner
- Noes:** 2 -  
Richard L. Slayton and Jay B. Ferm

6. [17126](#) 7102 US Highway 12/18 - Amended PUD(GDP-SIP) - Dane County Waste Transfer Station 16th Ald. Dist.

The motion for final approval provided for the following:

- Option for the introduction of concrete curving to facilitate snow plowing.
- The Urban Design Commission feels that screening from the adjacent highway is unnecessary.

**A motion was made by Barnett, seconded by Rummel, to Grant Final Approval.**

The motion passed by voice vote/other.

#### ROLL CALL

**Present:** 8 -

Marsha A. Rummel; Mark M. Smith; Dawn O. Weber; Todd R. Barnett;  
Bruce F. Woods; Richard L. Slayton; R. Richard Wagner and Jay B. Ferm

**Excused:** 2 -

John A. Harrington and Ronald S. Luskin

7. [10043](#) 515 South Midvale Boulevard - PUD-SIP, Phase 2, Sequoya Commons Signage Package. 11th Ald. Dist.

The motion required that the multi-tenant ground sign be set back an additional 5-feet with the maximum height of letters for wall signage to be at 18" with logo elements allowed at 30.

**A motion was made by Slayton, seconded by Weber, to Grant Final Approval. The motion passed by voice vote/other.**

#### ROLL CALL

**Present:** 9 -

Marsha A. Rummel; Mark M. Smith; Dawn O. Weber; Todd R. Barnett;  
Bruce F. Woods; Richard L. Slayton; John A. Harrington; R. Richard Wagner and Jay B. Ferm

**Excused:** 1 -

Ronald S. Luskin

8. [16968](#) 1208, 1212, 1214 Spring Street - PUD (GDP-SIP) 8th Ald. Dist.

The project was referred with the applicant instructed to provide floor plans and confirmation of building materials and colors, with details supported with required building elevations and renderings, along with providing a landscape plan. The lack of details resulted in the referral and prevented the Commission from making an informed decision on the project. It was further noted that the project was moving in the right direction but required more attention to detail such as the need to see details on roof treatments, and address the concern with the potential for fading of color concrete. It was further noted to provide the requirements associated with initial approval of the project within the application packet with further consideration.

**A motion was made by Smith, seconded by Barnett, to Refer to the URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION. The motion passed by voice vote/other.**

**BREAK - 7:30-7:45 p.m.**

9. [15511](#) 666 Wisconsin Avenue - PUD(GDP-SIP) - Edgewater Hotel Expansion. 2nd Ald. Dist.

In support of the motion Wager noted that many of those 19th century stone mansions were still there but when we created the historic district it was not a 19th century neighborhood. Those unique buildings were there but the 19th century neighborhood was not there. And so the purpose of the historic district was not to preserve the 19th century neighborhood, which was long gone, but rather to try and keep some of those houses which were so unique to Madison's history still there. The tool was to try to preserve those mansions because they were important and significant and my own gut sense is that for things like Third Lake Ridge, historic districts have worked pretty well, University Heights, they've worked pretty well, they've encouraged a lot of preservation. But I'm not sure they're sufficient tools for Mansion Hill, I think Mansion Hill needs some additional tools. So I'm not as whetted to clinging to just the historic district as the only way to try to do preservation of Mansion Hill. I think we need to think about that as a City in a much broader way. Approving this project is not going to repeal the historic district, they're still going to be there. This project would change the zoning for one parcel that is now RH6 to add it to the rest of the parcel which is OR and we never put an overlay zoning in the OR part so that's why there are not height restrictions in the OR, so really the question is whether it's appropriate to add this additional parcel, not the question of the height in my mind. If you look at the lakefront, none of that lakefront between the existing Edgewater and James Madison is that small residential scale, you have the barracks in there, you have several high rise apartment buildings, you have the University's concrete style boathouse, so it's not the lakeshore that is that 19th century neighborhood, as I said it's largely gone. The other thing that was interesting during this debate is that we've heard some of the opponents say oh it will be fine if we simply just lay it on its side and they've shown a model that sort of took all that mass and laid it over the National Guardian Life property. Either the mass is too big whether it's upright or laid down, but it's the same mass, and so I'm not sure it's the question of the mass. So then you get back to the question of the actual design we have. I do want to compliment the architect. We have seen I think remarkable design work on this, and such good work we should have on other projects in the City we would be very happy with. Any project has pluses and minuses, in this case solving that 70's mistake is a big thing for the rest of the City I think, because it gives us lake access and views. The other thing that is a Citywide issue is the restoration of the 1940's building and I think that's a big advance for preservation. Condos as owner-occupied is another thing on the City's plan, and sharing parking is one of those policies that we've talked about for a long while. So there's a lot of goods with this project and perhaps some drawbacks. I come down on the side that it is approvable and the design I think is a masterpiece of design, for us not to recommend it would sort of say something about well, you can take a project and change it and come up with a better design and then we won't recommend it, and I don't think that's a good way to act as a City either. Further discussion on the motion by the Commission noted:

- Ald. Rummel noted that, “for me as an Alder who represents three historic districts and a national/federal district, so I’m unique I think on the council and they’re different districts but they each share this notion of the visually compatible area and so I feel personally very concerned that that standard not get diminished by anything that we do here. And so that’s why I asked Alder Maniaci if she was going to recommend to the developers that they go back to Landmarks. I heard her say yes and I would reaffirm my request. When I look at the PUD standards which I’ve had in front of me all night long, I think there’s still some questions that the PC will be addressing and the compatibility with the physical nature of the area, I really would like to hear what Landmarks has to say before I finally decide because at the Council I have to go back and overturn, or not, a decision which was a previous iteration of this plan.
- My biggest concern is still the precedent that’s being set.
- We spoke about the massing of the tower itself and how that’s compatible on a smaller scale to the neighborhood and to the changes that have been made to the design. It’s had substantial changes from what was first brought to us and it’s becoming more and more compatible and I look forward to seeing during them during the final review process getting down to a level of providing details on the fenestration of this building and I think with that the building becomes even more compatible with the site at the level.
- This has been a tough project. I support the principal of the project, I think it’s a great use of the site. There are so many pluses that you guys have brought to it and I really respect the work that you put in, you’ve been very responsive and you’re gone above and beyond in a lot of cases in terms of digging into rethinking your design from moving, how you evolved the parking garage to moving the parking garage entirely. I really think you guys have moved mountains in that sense. This is a unique location, it’s a confluence of historic districts but it’s also a confluence of different densities, old vs. new, it’s part of why it’s so complicated, it’s also why it’s such a cool site. I still think we have a fair amount of progress to go on the architectural side because I think that it’s not quite there yet, but I can see it’s within sight in terms of it being good enough. At this point I’m leaning towards initial approval, but I do think that there is still a ways to go before we can say it’s good enough.
- I believe that the team has made an honest effort to try to address the issue of height with this proposed building, specifically the tower, I still find it unacceptable mostly because as I mentioned back in August, you’ve got a privileged site here. You’ve got the privilege of sitting in the front row of a performance if you will, on the lake, and yet that doesn’t seem to be good enough here, it seems to be the case that the applicant feels the need to stand up rather than sit in the front

row. I can't describe it better than that, I mean that says it all. However, they have made the case time and time again as they've come before us, that they need all these rooms, they need this height, they need this mass, or this project isn't feasible. I'm not sure this is the only way to accomplish it, I'm not convinced. So as this project is currently proposed before us this evening I cannot support it based on that particular issue.

- As presented this project does lots of great things, and I would hope that everybody even if you're in opposition can actually recognize it. It restores an old building, it provides lakeside access, it improves the view, it provides amenities, but I'm still struggling with the height as I'm sure all of you are aware from my questions.

The motion passed with the following conditions:

1. Provide detailing on the plaza and how the landscape is going to affect the views, how people are going to flow pedestrian traffic through the plaza.
2. Initial approval specifically be site design relative to the mass of the new structure with everything that's on the ground still open for massaging.
3. More work is needed, specifically details of the café space and corridor and entry with some close-ups of the main entry and that of the wheelchair accessible entry to the end of the building.
4. In the elevations and renderings, you're looking at it from a long distance off and you can't see the details. It's a big building in a complicated space and so what we're going to need provided are the details. For example, how the stairs actually look along with what the entrance to the parking garage, how the plaza is going to be with the ballroom (if you're standing on the plaza how does it look into the ballroom or look out?), along with all the requirements for final approval including all details of the site and landscape plan elements, the 40's building restoration and the extra floor, including the finish of the penthouse of the tower and all affected building elevations.

**A motion was made by Wagner, seconded by Weber, to Grant Initial Approval.  
The motion passed by the following vote:**

**Recused:** 1 -

Ronald S. Luskin

**Ayes:** 5 -

Dawn O. Weber; Bruce F. Woods; Richard L. Slayton; R. Richard Wagner and Marsha A. Rummel

**Noes:** 4 -

Mark M. Smith; Todd R. Barnett; John A. Harrington and Jay B. Ferm

## **BUSINESS BY MEMBERS**

None.

## ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Slayton, seconded by Smith, to Adjourn at 12:07 a.m.  
The motion passed by voice vote/other.